

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/831,995	STEPANOV ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Armando Rodriguez	2828	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Armando Rodriguez. (3) Quyen Leung.

(2) James Davie. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 15 March 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 69, 77 and 89.

Identification of prior art discussed: Scrifes et al (PN 5,103,456) and Feuer (PN 6,078,597).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative discussed the cited Scribes et al reference as teaching away from the claimed invention, by preventing the feedback signal from entering the DFB laser cavity and discussed the cited reference Feuer not teaching phase discriminating properties of the saturable absorption element. Applicant's representative agreed to provide a written submission clearly discussing these deficiencies of the cited prior arts for reconsideration by the examiner.